

# **REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM AGENDA**



**Friday 29 September 2006**

**at 10.00am**

**in Committee Room B**

**MEMBERS: REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM:**

Councillors RW Cook, S Cook, Gibbon, Laffey, London, A Marshall, J Marshall, Richardson, Wallace, D Waller and Wright.

**Resident Representatives:**

James Atkinson, Mary Power and Iris Ryder

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
- 2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
- 3. MINUTES – TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17 AUGUST 2006 (TO FOLLOW)**
- 4. RESPONSES FROM THE COUNCIL, THE EXECUTIVE OR COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL TO FINAL REPORTS OF THIS FORUM**
- 5. CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY REVIEWS REFERRED VIA SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE**

No items.

No items.

**6. CONSIDERATION OF PROGRESS REPORTS / BUDGET AND POLICY  
FRAMEWORK DOCUMENTS**

- 6.1 Portfolio Holder's Response to the Partnerships Investigation (*Director of Regeneration and Planning Services and the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Liveability and Housing*)

**7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

Scrutiny Investigation into Railway Approaches:-

- 7.1 Railway Approaches– Evidence from the MP for Hartlepool – Covering Report (*Scrutiny Support Officer*)
- 7.2 Railway Approaches– Evidence from the Authority's Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Liveability and Housing – Covering Report (*Scrutiny Support Officer*)
- 7.3 Railway Approaches– Evidence from External Agencies – Covering Report (*Scrutiny Support Officer*)

**8. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT**

**FOR INFORMATION**

**Date of Next Meeting – Thursday 2 November 2006 commencing at 10.00am.  
Venue to be confirmed.**

# **REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM MINUTES**

17 August 2006

**Present:**

Councillor: Stephen Wallace (In the Chair)

Councillors: Rob W Cook, Pauline Laffey, Frances London,  
Ann Marshall and Edna Wright

**Resident Representatives:**

James Atkinson and Iris Ryder

Also present: Councillor J Brash as substitute for Councillor S Cook in  
accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4.2

Officers: Alistair Smith, Head of Technical Services  
Geoff Thompson, Head of Regeneration  
Richard Waldmeyer, Principal Planning Officer (Policy Planning  
and Information)  
John Lewer, Public Transport Coordinator  
Jonathan Wistow, Scrutiny Support Officer  
David Cosgrove, Principal Democratic Services Officer

## **17. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Shaun Cook,  
John Marshall, Carl Richardson and Denis Waller.

## **18. Declarations of interest by Members**

None.

## **19. Minutes of the meeting held on 13 July 2006**

Confirmed.

**20. Responses from the Council, the Executive or Committees of the Council to Final Reports of this Forum**

No items.

**21. Consideration of request for scrutiny reviews referred via Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee**

No items.

**22. Consideration of progress reports/budget and policy framework documents**

No items.

**23. Railway Approaches Departmental Presentations**

*(Scrutiny Support Officer)*

The Scrutiny Support Officer introduced Geoff Thompson, Head of Regeneration, Richard Waldmeyer, Principal Planning Officer (Policy Planning and Information) and Alistair Smith, Head of Technical Services who made presentations to the Forum.

Geoff Thompson indicated that the image that Hartlepool presented was key to promoting the town both in terms of tourism and economic development. Significant investment had been made over recent years through major private and publicly funded schemes such as the Hartlepool Marina development, City Challenge, SRB schemes, New Deal for Communities and the European Regional Development Fund for example. The future development of the Victoria Harbour was another future scheme that would bring further major investment and new people and businesses into the town. Developments along the A19 corridor and at Wynyard also drew new people to the town seeking quality housing.

All of these factors added to Hartlepool's vision as a "prosperous, caring, confident and outward-looking community, in an attractive environment, realising its potential". Major tourist initiatives such as the Tall Ships event in 2010 would also place Hartlepool 'centre-stage' with significant numbers of visitors, many of whom would arrive by rail. Both the tourism and economic development factors would therefore benefit from an image and perception upon arrival in Hartlepool that was a high quality one.

Members questioned the potential numbers of jobs created through the Victoria Harbour Scheme. These were likely to number around five thousand, with a significant number being longer term jobs based on the overall Masterplan development. The authority would work closely with Learning and Skills Council to ensure that as many of those jobs as possible were taken by

local people. In response to further questions it was indicated that any tourist developments would include appropriate visitor facilities, such as public toilets.

Richard Waldmeyer indicated that the recently approved Local Plan included policies and statements to promote the quality of the approaches into the town. Some approaches such as the rail line from Hart Station were already very attractive. The main station in Church Street was in a conservation area which would need to be considered in any future developments.

In relation to the development of land bordering the rail line, Richard Waldmeyer stated that Network Rail was always consulted on such applications. In the past, however, the land adjacent to the rail line had been utilised by 'untidy' users. Where planning controls existed to control these users, they were enforced by the Planning Division. The tidying up of untidy sites along the rail line would need to be fed into the development of the list of untidy sites in the town which needed attention.

Members expressed their concern at the former Britmag site in the north of the town which was both derelict and now in a dangerous condition. The Chair commented that the Council obviously had some powers it could use in this case but that they needed to be used both proactively and intelligently. Members asked what conflict there was between the Church Street Conservation Area and the Transport Interchange project. Richard Waldmeyer stated that there was no conflict as the design of the project had taken the needs of the conservation area into consideration. The tidying up of that area and the redevelopments at the station would only enhance the conservation area.

Alistair Smith outlined the issues around the Hartlepool and Seaton Carew Railway Stations and the future rail developments for the town. Improvements were needed at the main railway station and the new transport interchange project would bring many improvements to access and car parking in particular. The wall closing off the view between the station and the Marina and the lack of easy access to the Marina were major concerns that wouldn't be addressed by the project.

There was also scope for some improvements at Seaton Carew Station, though what was of more concern was that many residents thought the station was closed. Officers were working with Network Rail and Northern rail on some improvements that could enhance the station.

The Transport Interchange was the major multi-modal transport development that the Council had been working towards for several years. It was now hoped that work on site would commence late this year following the protracted legal issues that had needed to be resolved. The new transport interchange and the improvements to the station would link into the new services to be introduced by Grand Central directly linking Hartlepool to London. The decline in rail services over recent years, such as the loss of the former Cleveland Executive service and the direct Middlesbrough to Manchester Airport link, had affected the whole Tees Valley. These losses

were now slowly being over-turned and the potential for a new high quality Tees Valley Rapid Transit System provided huge scope and potential for transport improvements.

Members commented on the improvements to Seaton Carew Station and considered that improvements were also needed elsewhere, such as Hart Station. The value of the smaller stations on the network was acknowledged, particularly in light of the future tourism developments in the borough and the Tees Valley Rapid Transit System. New stations should also be considered in light of the development of the rapid transit system, the Marina being one location.

The Chairman thanked the three officers for the excellent presentations which had assisted in giving context and background to the Scrutiny Forum's investigation.

### **Decision**

That the presentations be noted.

## **24. Railway Approaches – Evidence from the Authority's Portfolio Holder for Culture, Leisure and Transportation**

Councillor Victor Tumilty, Culture, Leisure and Transportation Portfolio Holder thanked the Chair and the Forum for the invitation to the meeting. Councillor Tumilty indicated that he had visited the stations and the site of the interchange prior to the meeting. He considered that the new interchange development would be a significant improvement not only for the area around the station but the whole town. The new Grand Central services to London made it important that the railway station gave a good impression of the town. The interchange would provide excellent bus facilities and it was essential that these be utilised to attract new services providing improved public transport links for the town. The potential new rapid transit system could also provide a new important service for the town. Potential works to the Seaton Carew station would include improvements to security both for users on the station and in the car park.

Members asked if the Portfolio Holder was aware of the situation at Hart Station? Councillor Tumilty indicated that he had asked for the reinstatement of the station during the discussion on the recent presentation by the Joint Strategy Unit on the Rapid Transit System. The station had a very large passenger catchment area and as members indicated, was the nearest rail halt to Crimdon Dene where significant investment was being made at the holiday park. Councillor Tumilty indicated that the smaller railway stations needed to be retained and improved as they could play a significant part in the future, should the rapid transit system be extended into Hartlepool. One member indicated their concern that, as they understood the situation at present, there was no designated disabled parking at the station. While

accepting that the improvement scheme would rectify the situation, could not something be done now? The Head of Technical Services indicated that if this was the situation, he could assure members that it would be corrected immediately.

**Decision**

That Councillor Victor Tumilty, Culture, Leisure and Transportation Portfolio Holder, be thanked for his attendance at the meeting and his responses to members questions.

**25. Railway Approaches** (*Scrutiny Support Officer*)

The Scrutiny Support Officer reported that due to rail works it had been necessary to reschedule the site visit which would have included the rail journey to view the approaches to the town. At the next meeting of the Forum on 29 September, 2006 representatives from the rail operators would be present and the Scrutiny Support Officer considered that it may be prudent to hear what the operators had to say before viewing the approaches first hand. The Chair indicated his support for this but asked that, if possible, a number of dates could be proposed for the visit so as to select a date when the largest proportion of Members could attend.

**Decision**

That the report and Chair's comments be noted.

STEPHEN WALLACE

CHAIRMAN

## **REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM**

**29 September 2006**



**Report of:** Director of Regeneration and Planning Services and the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Liveability and Housing.

**Subject** PORTFOLIO HOLDERS RESPONSE TO THE PARTNERSHIPS INVESTIGATION

---

### **1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide Members of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum with feedback on the recommendations from the investigation into Partnerships which was reported to Cabinet on 15 May 2006.

### **2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 2.1 The investigation into Partnerships conducted by this Forum falls under the remit of the Regeneration and Planning Services Department and is, under the Executive Delegation Scheme, within the service area covered by the Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio Holder.
- 2.2 On 15 May 2006 Cabinet considered the Final Report of the Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum into Partnerships. In addition, this action plan was approved by Cabinet on 29 August 2006. This report provides feedback from the Portfolio Holder following the Cabinet's consideration of, and decisions in relation to, this Forum's recommendations.
- 2.3 In addition to this report a further progress report will be produced for Member's consideration (detailing progress to the end of March 2007) to monitor the implementation of their recommendations.

### **3. SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS AND EXECUTIVE DECISION**

- 3.1 Following consideration of the Final Report, Cabinet approved the recommendations in their entirety. Details of each recommendation, proposed actions to be taken and progress to date are provided in the Action Plan attached at **Appendix A**.



#### **4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 4.1 That Members note the proposed actions detailed within the Action Plan, appended to this report (**Appendix A**) and seek clarification on its content where felt appropriate.

**Contact Officer:-** Joanne Smithson  
Head of Community Strategy  
Regeneration & Planning Services Department  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Telephone Number: 01429 284147  
E-mail – joanne.smithson@hartlepool.gov.uk

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:-

- (i) The Regeneration and Planning Services Scrutiny Forum's Final Report – Scrutiny Investigation into Partnerships considered by Cabinet on 15 May 2006.
- (ii) Decision Record of Cabinet held on 15 May 2006.

# PARTNERSHIPS ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

## APPENDIX A

NAME OF FORUM: Regeneration & Planning Services Scrutiny Forum

NAME OF SCRUTINY ENQUIRY: Partnerships Enquiry

DECISION MAKING DATE OF FINAL REPORT: Cabinet on 15 May 2006

DECISION ON ACTION PLAN: Cabinet 29<sup>th</sup> August 2006

PRESENTATION TO SCRUTINY FORUM: 29<sup>th</sup> September 2006

RECOMMENDATION		PROPOSED ACTION / PROGRESS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	FINANCIAL / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS
(a)	That the Council seeks to strengthen the feedback mechanisms (to the Local Authority) for its representatives on the Regional Assembly and	The Constitution Working Group should consider establishing feedback mechanisms from its representatives on Partnerships to Council.  <b>No progress to date</b>	Tony Brown  Constitution Working Group	December 2006	Work programme of Constitution Working Group. Officer time to support group.
	(Direct link with recommendation (s))  that substitute arrangements for those representatives should be clarified.	Contact the Regional Assembly and clarify substitute arrangements.  <b>Initial enquiry made</b>	Angela Hunter  Democratic Services	September 2006	No significant additional resource requirements
(b)	That the Council seeks clarification from the RDA around the selection process for representatives on this body.	The Mayor to write to the RDA to request this information  <b>Initial enquiry made</b>	Paul Walker	September 2006	No significant additional resource requirements
(c)	That the Council produces further information about the LAA process for a wider audience, and that this should incorporate summary sheets and diagrams.	Produced a LAA information sheet  <b>Initial enquiry made</b>	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services  Support from	October 2006	Officer time to prepare summary sheet.  Photocopying /distribution costs

RECOMMENDATION	PROPOSED ACTION / PROGRESS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	FINANCIAL / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS
----------------	-------------------------------	--------------	-----------------------	---

			Corporate Strategy		
(d)	That Scrutiny continues to be involved in the LAA process, and that in the next round of negotiations all Scrutiny Fora are involved at the formative stage.	None – note for negotiation of new LAA in 2008 for implementation in 2009/10	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	-	-
(e)	That increased levels of community and voluntary sector representation be examined on the Lifelong Learning Partnership and the Children and Young People Partnership, including the Executive.	Review Community and Voluntary Sector representation on the Children's Trust  Review community and voluntary sector representation on new Partnership structures for Lifelong Learning  <b>Discussion on governance arrangements scheduled for October meeting of Hartlepool Partnership.</b>	Adrienne Simcock Children's Services  Support from Peter Scott, Regeneration & Planning Services and Adult & Community Services.	April 2007	Officer time to review arrangements and consult on options.
(f)	That the levels of voluntary sector representation be increased on the Tees Valley Partnership and  also direct Local Strategic Partnership representation on the TVP.  In addition, the Town's MP and Mayor should be invited to support the strengthening of the representation on the TVP.	May or to write to the Tees Valley Partnership requesting update on voluntary sector representation in new proposed structures.  <b>No progress to date</b>  MP to write to the Tees Valley Partnership requesting update on voluntary sector representation in new proposed structures  <b>No progress to date</b>	Paul Walker   Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	September 2006   September 2006	No significant additional resource requirements
(g)	That an appropriate measure be put in place for the election of voluntary representatives on the Tees Valley	Head of Adult & Community Services to write to enquire as to current arrangements	Nicola Bailey Adult & Community Services	September 2006	No significant additional resource requirements

	RECOMMENDATION	PROPOSED ACTION / PROGRESS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	FINANCIAL / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS
	Partnership through the Voluntary Sector Forum.	<b>Mechanisms for elections now revised – recommendation no longer required.</b>			
(h)	That the need for infrastructure organisation offering support to the wider VCS be recognised by the Council and be appropriately funded.	Continue to support the NE Centre of Excellence funded Building Links Programme.  Review the funding of infrastructure organisations by the Community Pool as part of COMPACT re-launch  <b>Scrutiny inquiry into voluntary sector funding progressing</b>	Nicola Bailey Adult & Community Services  Geoff Thompson Regeneration & Planning Services	March 2007	Funding from the NE Centre of Excellence secured to March 07
(i)	That discussions are held with the Mayor, the MP and Council to support the issue of voluntary representation on the thematic partnerships.	Hold meeting to discuss the issue of voluntary representation on the thematic partnerships  <b>No additional resource implications</b>	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	Schedule meeting for October 2006	No additional resource implications
(j)	That Scrutiny's involvement in the on-going review of the Community Strategy be strengthened across all Scrutiny Fora.	Scrutiny Co-ordinating committee to review 1 <sup>st</sup> draft and final draft of the Community Strategy  <b>1<sup>st</sup> draft of Community Strategy to be considered by Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> September</b>	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	September 2006 February 2007	Officer time to support process
(k)	That Elected Member involvement in Thematic and other partnerships be recommended.	To be considered following publication of the Local Government White Paper and revised guidance on the role of LSPs due in Autumn  <b>Recommendation discussed with all Theme Partnerships.</b>	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	Unable to be set	Unable to determine at this point

RECOMMENDATION	PROPOSED ACTION / PROGRESS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	FINANCIAL / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS
(l)	That roles and responsibilities for <u>ALL</u> members of Theme Partnerships be encouraged as part of good practice.	Prepare a Hartlepool Partnership good governance guide that incorporates this recommendation  <b>Governance Standard produced and meetings have taken place will all Theme Partnership lead Officers</b>	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services  October 2006	Officer time to prepare guidance, review good practice, liaise with individual Theme Partnerships.
(m)	That an annual review of both the levels of community representation and the compact be reviewed as part of the Best Value Performance Review.	Collate information on the level of community representation on Theme Partnerships annually  <b>No progress to date.</b>  Initiate a re-launch of the COMPACT as set out in the Strengthening Communities Best Value Review Strategic Improvement Plan  <b>Strengthening Communities Best Value Review Strategic Improvement Plan to be considered by Cabinet 25<sup>th</sup> September.</b>	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services  April 2007  Geoff Thompson Regeneration & Planning Services  October 2006	Officer time to prepare profoma, issue to Theme Partnerships, analyse results.  A review of the COMPACT will require additional resources including staff time and identification of a budget to support community and voluntary sector engagement
(n)	That the Council emphasises the importance of continued partnership working, and supports co-terminus arrangements between the Council, Police and PCT.	No further actions proposed		
(o)	The level of officer time committed to partnerships be examined in order to ensure it is tailored to the appropriate requirements.	CMT review officer time committed to partnerships  <b>No progress to date</b>	Chief Executive / CMT  March 2007	CMT time to carry out review
(p)	That the attendance records of all Members i.e. Councillors on	Constitution Working Group examine the feasibility of this	Tony Brown Constitution Working  April 2006	Working group members time and

	RECOMMENDATION	PROPOSED ACTION / PROGRESS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	FINANCIAL / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS
	partnerships be produced as a public document.	recommendation <b>No progress to date</b>	Group / Democratic Services		officer support
(q)	That in relation to communication and information dissemination an internal and external communication protocol should be developed. In this respect the Forum welcomed the development of a 'Tool Kit' for resident's use as part of the review of the Community Strategy.	No further actions proposed as Hartlepool Partnership Communications Strategy agreed and Community Strategy Toolkit produced			
(r)	That a section be included in the State of the Borough Debate to feedback the work and success of the Hartlepool Partnership and the Theme Partnerships.	The Mayor to include a section on the work and success of the Hartlepool Partnership and the Theme Partnerships in his State of the Borough presentation. <b>Initial discussions on format taken place</b>	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	Autumn 2006	Officer time to collate required information
(s)	That where possible Councillors attending events across the town take the opportunity to feedback the work and success of the partnerships they are involved in.	No further actions in addition to action identified at recommendation (a) <b>No progress to date</b>	Tony Brown Constitution Working Group	December 2006	Working group members time and officer support
(t)	That informal (quarterly) meetings are arranged to enable elected representatives sitting on Partnerships to feedback on their involvement in these partnerships to other Elected Members and resident representatives.	Constitution Working Group examine the feasibility of this recommendation <b>No progress to date</b>	Tony Brown Constitution Working Group	December 2006	Working group members time and officer support
(u)	That the development of a 'map' outlining how the Council's departments, political structures, LSP and Theme Partnerships are aligned be explored.	Ensure recommendations are included in conclusions of Governance Review <b>No progress to date</b>	Peter Scott Regeneration & Planning Services	December 2006	Significant Officer time to review implications of White Paper and set out proposed response
(v)	Members recommend that a summary of this report be produced as a guide to	Produce a guide to partnership working.	Joanne Smithson Regeneration &	April 2007	Staff time to collate information, prepare,

## PARTNERSHIPS ENQUIRY ACTION PLAN

**APPENDIX A**

RECOMMENDATION	PROPOSED ACTION / PROGRESS	LEAD OFFICER	DELIVERY TIMESCALE	FINANCIAL / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS
----------------	-------------------------------	--------------	-----------------------	---

	partnership working. In addition, the guide should be produced in an accessible format for circulation to a wider audience, with the PR office.	<b>No progress to date</b>	Planning Services with input from Scrutiny Support and Public Relations		draft and produce.  Publishing and distribution costs
(w)	That the Cabinet produce an Action-Plan in response to these recommendations detailing both timescales for action if approved and responsible officers. In addition the Forum recommends that Cabinet report back to the Forum within 3-6 months of receipt.	Action Plan to Scrutiny Forum on 29 September  Update on Plan implementation to be presented in March 07  <b>Action Plan agreed by cabinet 29 August.</b>	Joanne Smithson Regeneration & Planning Services	Action Plan to Scrutiny Forum on 29 September 2006  Update on Plan implementation to be presented in March 2007	

## **REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM REPORT**

29 September 2006



**Report of:** Scrutiny Support Officer

**Subject:** RAILWAY APPROACHES – EVIDENCE FROM THE  
MP FOR HARTLEPOOL – COVERING REPORT

---

### **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that the Member of Parliament for Hartlepool will be in attendance at this meeting to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing investigation into Railway Approaches.

### **2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 13 July 2006, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry/Sources of Evidence were approved by the Forum for this scrutiny investigation.
- 2.2 Consequently, the MP for Hartlepool will be in attendance at today's meeting to provide verbal evidence to the Forum and answer any questions Members may have.
- 2.3 During this evidence gathering session with the MP, it is suggested that responses should be sought to the following key questions:-
- (a) What do you consider to be the impact of the railway approaches into Hartlepool on the town's image, particularly in terms of the ongoing regeneration of the town?
  - (b) Given the recent award of the 2010 Tall Ships Race what are your views on the likely impact of the railway approaches into the town on the broader ambitions for regeneration flowing from this development?
  - (c) How do you propose to utilise recent key developments such as the Tall Ships Race 2010 and the award of a Hartlepool to London rail service to improve the railway approaches into the town?

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**



- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of the MP for Hartlepool in relation to the questions outlined in section 2.3.

**CONTACT OFFICER**

Jonathan Wistow – Scrutiny Support Officer  
Chief Executive's Department- Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 523 647  
Email: jonathan.wistow@hartlepool.gov.uk

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The following background paper was used in preparation of this report:-

- (a) Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool's 'Railway Approaches' – Scoping Report (Scrutiny Support Officer) – 13.07.06

## REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM REPORT

29 September 2006



**Report of:** Scrutiny Support Officer

**Subject:** RAILWAY APPROACHES – EVIDENCE FROM THE  
AUTHORITY'S PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR  
REGENERATION, LIVEABILITY AND HOUSING –  
COVERING REPORT

---

### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Liveability and Housing has been invited to attend this meeting to provide evidence in relation to the ongoing investigation into Railway Approaches.

### 2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 13 July 2006, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry/Sources of Evidence were approved by the Forum for this scrutiny investigation.
- 2.2 Consequently, the Authority's Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Liveability and Housing has been invited to this meeting to provide evidence to Forum in relation to his responsibilities, and views on, the railway approaches into Hartlepool.
- 2.3 During this evidence gathering session with the Authority's Regeneration, Liveability and Housing Portfolio Holder, it is suggested that responses should be sought to the following key questions:-
- (a) What are your roles and responsibilities in relation to improving the railway approaches in the town?
  - (b) What do you consider to be the impact of the railway approaches into Hartlepool on the town's image, particularly in terms of the ongoing regeneration of the town?
  - (c) Given the recent award of the 2010 Tall Ships Race what are your views on the likely impact of the railway approaches into the town on the broader ambitions for regeneration flowing from this development?

- (d) How do you propose to utilise recent key developments such as the Tall Ships Race 2010 and the award of a Hartlepool to London rail service to improve the railway approaches into the town?
- (e) What are your views on the progress being made to improve untidy /derelict land and buildings in the town?

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Liveability and Housing in relation to the questions outlined in section 2.3.

#### **CONTACT OFFICER**

Jonathan Wistow – Scrutiny Support Officer  
Chief Executive's Department- Corporate Strategy  
Hartlepool Borough Council  
Tel: 01429 523 647  
Email: jonathan.wistow@hartlepool.gov.uk

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The following background paper was used in preparation of this report:-

- (a) Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool's 'Railway Approaches' – Scoping Report (Scrutiny Support Officer) – 13.07.06

## REGENERATION AND PLANNING SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM REPORT

29 September 2006



**Report of:** Scrutiny Support Officer

**Subject:** RAILWAY APPROACHES – EVIDENCE FROM  
EXTERNAL AGENCIES – COVERING REPORT

---

### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of the Forum that representatives from a number of external agencies will be attending today's meeting and to provide a brief background to the bodies they are representing.

### 2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 Members will recall that at the meeting of this Forum on 13 July 2006, the Terms of Reference and Potential Areas of Inquiry/Sources of Evidence were approved by the Forum for this scrutiny investigation.

- 2.2 Consequently, the following external agencies have been invited to this meeting:

- I. Network Rail;
- II. Northern Rail; and
- III. Grand Central.

#### **Network Rail**

- 2.3 Network Rail will be in attendance at today's meeting to provide verbal evidence in relation to their role in terms of Railway Approaches. The national rail network infrastructure (track, signalling, bridges, tunnels and stations) is owned and operated by Network Rail. As such, Network Rail is a key organisation in terms of the railway approaches into Hartlepool. Consequently, they will provide a general overview of their role in relation to Fly Tipping and Graffiti in particular. Members may then want to question representatives from Network Rail in relation to their responsibilities for these areas.

#### **Northern Rail**

- 2.4 Whilst Network Rail owns all the railway stations in the country, with the exception of a number of 'principal' stations, which it operates itself, Network

Rail leases the stations to whichever train operator is the principal user. The principal train operator in Hartlepool is Northern Rail. Representatives from Northern Rail will be in attendance at today's meeting and will provide verbal evidence to the Forum. The Forum may then want to question Northern Rail about its responsibilities in relation to this issue.

### **Grand Central**

- 2.5 Following the recent award of a Hartlepool to London rail service representatives from Grand Central have agreed to attend today's meeting and answer any questions Members may have. However, given that this contract was awarded to Grand Central so recently and they have only limited responsibility for the railway approaches into the town they have decided to not make a presentation (verbal or written) to the Forum. Nevertheless, representatives from Grand Central will be present at the meeting to take part in discussions and answer any questions Members may have.

## **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 That Members of the Forum consider the views of the external agencies and question them accordingly.

### **CONTACT OFFICER**

Jonathan Wistow – Scrutiny Support Officer  
 Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy  
 Hartlepool Borough Council  
 Tel: 01429 523 647  
 Email: jonathan.wistow@hartlepool.gov.uk

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The following background paper was used in preparation of this report:-

- (a) Scrutiny Investigation into Hartlepool's 'Railway Approaches' – Scoping Report (Scrutiny Support Officer) – 13.07.06